

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.BHAVADASAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 24TH DAY OF JUNE 2015/3RD ASHADHA, 1937

RP.No. 172 of 2015 IN CRP.612/2014

AGAINST THE ORDER IN CRP 612/2014 of HIGH COURT OF
KERALA.

I.A.1733/13 IN O.P.(ELE) 214/13 OF ADDL. DISTRICT
JUDGE-I, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

REVIEW PETITIONER(S)/REVISION PETITIONERS IN CRP:

-
1. THE KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD,
REPRESENTED BY ITS DEPUTY CHIEF ENGINEER
TRANSMISSION CIRCLE, 9TH FLOOR, VYDUTHI BHAVAN,
PATTOM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 004.
(NOW KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD LIMITED).
 2. THE ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
TRANSMISSION SUB DIVISION, ATTINGAL.

BY ADV. SRI.SAJEEVKUMAR K.GOPAL, SC, KSEB

RESPONDENT(S)/RESPONDENT IN CRP:

THULASEEDHARAN,
MUNDAKKAL VILAKOM VEEDU, ALAMCODE VILLAGE,
CHIRAYINKEEZHU TALUK, VANCHIYOOR P.O.,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 035.

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 24-06-2015 ALONG WITH R.P. 228/2015, THE COURT ON THE
SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

P. BHAVADASAN, J.

- - - - -
R.P. No. 172 of 2015 in
C.R.P. No. 612 of 2014 &
R.P. No. 228 of 2015 in
C.R.P. No. 611 of 2004
- - - - -

Dated this the 24th day of June, 2015.

ORDER

These petitions are directed against the common order dated 27.10.2014 in C.R.P. Nos. 611 and 612 of 2014 whereby this Court declined to interfere with the order of the court below which thought it proper and fit to condone the delay in filing the petitions. In these two review petitions, the petitioner produced Annexures 1 and 2.

2. The apprehension expressed by the review petitioner is that taking aid of the orders of this court, in similar matters the court below may be persuaded to condone the delay which will cause considerable loss and injury to the Board.

3. It is pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner that huge delay is unexplained and the same reasons are given in

condoning the delay in all cases, a list of which is appended as Annexure 1.

4. This Court while disposing of the two C.R.Ps. only observed that even though the order passed by the court below may not be satisfactory, since the court below has chosen to exercise its discretion in favour of the petitioner before it, there was no reason for this Court to interfere with the order since it is not shown to be perverse. The mere fact that more such petitions are pending is not a ground to review the order in the Civil Revision Petitions. Each petition pending before the court below shall be disposed of on its own merits.

These Review Petitions are without merits and they are dismissed.

sb.

P. BHAVADASAN,
JUDGE